

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheets of drawings include a change to Figure 2, and a new Figure 4.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet of Figure 2

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes to Figure 2

New Figure 4.

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-39 are unchanged and remain pending in the application.

The objection to the drawings with respect to claims 4, 14, 24, and 34 is respectfully traversed. Figure 2 shows the claimed XML module (reference numeral 38), and the claimed GUI elements table 44 (reference numeral 44). Figure 3A shows in step 72 that the XML Module parses the selected XML Card (i.e., document) to identify GUI elements to be retrieved, and in step 74 that the GUI element identifiers are output to the GUI elements table with element display commands. Figure 3A also shows in step 76 that the GUI elements table outputs GUI elements to the display abstraction interface and the input abstraction interface. Hence, the drawings as originally filed satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR §1.83(a).

Nevertheless, Applicant submits a Drawing Change to change Figure and to add new Figure 4. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is being entered, as the Drawing Changes and accompanying changes to the specification are merely to ensure the features recited in the claims as originally filed are shown in the drawings.

Hence, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 7-13, 17,23, 27-33, and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,630 to Schuster et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of the independent claims 1, 10, 20, and 30 specify an arrangement in a network-enabled user interface device.

Claim 1 specifies:

1. A network-enabled user interface device, the device including:
  - a display screen configured for displaying display elements;
  - a user input interface configured for supplying user inputs;
  - an interface controller **configured for receiving application-based commands** for at least one of first operations, second operations, and third operations, **the interface controller configured for causing the display screen to display the display elements based on the first operations, configuring the user input interface for selected input operations based on the second operations, and generating application-based responses based on the supplied user inputs and the third operations;** and

an application controller configured for communication with executable application operations having generated the application-based commands and selectively transferring the application-based responses to selected ones of the executable application operations, *the application controller including a network interface configured for receiving the application-based commands and outputting selected ones of the application-based responses via an open protocol network.*

Claim 10 specifies:

10. A method of controlling a display screen and a user input interface of a network-enabled user interface device configured for network-based communications via an open protocol network, the method comprising:

receiving **application-based commands** for execution of at least one of first operations, second operations, and third operations from at least one of a plurality of executable application operations, *at least a first of the executable application operations in communication with the network-enabled user interface device via the open protocol network;*

first generating, by an interface controller, **selected display elements based on the first operations** and **selected input operations elements based on the second operations;**

causing the display screen to display the selected display elements and the user input interface to execute the selected input operations elements; and

second generating *application-based responses based on supplied user inputs to the user input interface based on the selected input operations elements, and based on the third operations.*

Claims 20 and 30 recite a computer readable medium having instructions for performing the features of claim 10, and a device having means for performing the functions of claim 10, respectively.

Hence, each of the independent claims specify that received **application-based commands** are used to generate **selected display elements** based on execution of first operations, **selected input operations elements** based on execution of second operations, and that the execution of the third operations are used to generate **application based responses**. As described at page 4, lines 13-21 of the specification, the generation and display of display elements based on received **application-based commands** enables control of the display screen **independent of telephony operations**. Hence, the interface controller can cause the display screen to display the display elements for **any**

**number of concurrently executing applications**, *regardless of whether the applications are executed locally within the device or remotely by a server.*

Hence, the device is able to receive application-based display or input interface commands arbitrarily from any application, even during an existing telephone call.

These and other features are neither disclosed nor suggested in the applied prior art.

Schuster et al. neither discloses nor suggests receiving **application-based commands** for execution of at least one of first operations for display of selected display elements, second operations for selected input operations elements, and third operations for selected application-based responses, especially where the application-based commands are received *via the open protocol network*, as claimed. Rather, Schuster et al. simply discloses in Fig. 2 user interface circuitry 208 that simply implements functions executed solely within the processor 204. In particular, the processor 204 is used to execute applications within the telephone, including placing calls using a dial plan (col. 9, line 60 to col. 10, line 9).

In particular, the processor 204 includes a media engine 222 and a signaling stack 224: the signaling stack 224 performs setup, management, and teardown of a call (col. 10, lines 10-41), where a User Agent (UA) implemented according to SIP protocol includes a User Agent Client (UAC) for issuing SIP requests, and a User Agent Server (UAS) for responding to requests (col. 10, lines 35-66). In particular, Fig. 3 illustrates a SIP message flow between a UAC 302 in one calling device to a UAS 306 of a called device. Hence, the local signaling stack 224 controls setup and teardown of SIP-based telephony calls.

After call setup, the media engine 222 manages the communication over a communication channel, and performs registration, voice-over-data, display data, keypad output, and dial plan functions. Further, packets received from the network and that include data for display are processed in the media engine 222 by a display data function (col. 12, line 44 to col. 13, line 34).

Hence, the user interface circuitry 208 in the telephone 108 is strictly based on control by either the applications executed by the signaling stack 224 or the media engine 222.

Consequently, Schuster et al. neither discloses nor suggests reception of **application based commands** via the network interface that are used for display, input, or logic operations, as claimed.

Hence, the rejection should be withdrawn because it fails to demonstrate that the applied reference discloses each and every element of the claim. See MPEP 2131. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "Anticipation cannot be predicated on teachings in the reference which are vague or based on conjecture." Studiengesellschaft Kohle mbH v. Dart Industries, Inc., 549 F. Supp. 716, 216 USPQ 381 (D. Del. 1982), aff'd, 726 F.2d 724, 220 USPQ 841 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

For these and other reasons, the §102 rejection in view of Schuster et al. should be withdrawn.

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4-6, 14-16, 24-26, and 34-36 is acknowledged with appreciation. It is believed these claims are allowable in their present form in view of the foregoing.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 95-465, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Leon R. Turkevich  
Registration No. 34,035

Customer Number 23164  
**Date: April 4, 2005**



Added elements 97a, 97b